THEOLOGY

VOL. LVI JUNE, 1953 No. 396

Typological Exegesis

"ALL these things", wrote St Paul, "happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition." Here, of course, the word *typos* is used, not in the sense in which it is employed in genuinely typological contexts, but simply to mean "example". Yet the use of an Old Testament narrative for the purpose of moral admonition presupposes the basic assumption which underlies typology proper—namely, that the history of God's people and of his dealings with them is a single continuous process in which a uniform pattern may be discerned. If Christians are to find admonition in the records of Israel's early history they must in some way be identified with the Israelites; they must be spiritually akin to the wanderers in the desert, and their own experience must be part of a continuous history, the first chapters of which are recorded in the Hebrew scriptures.

Earlier in his argument, St Paul had given his readers a notable example of genuine typology. The rock from which Israel drank in the wilderness was a type of Christ, and, because the sign mysteriously conveys the reality which it portrays, the rock *was* Christ. The Apostle is applying a familiar rabbinic method of exegesis to the needs of Christian preaching, but, although this particular application is somewhat forced, the method itself is but an extreme version of the early Christians' general way of understanding the Scriptures.

As the Church found, particularly in its conflict with Marcion, the use of typology is the most effective method of maintaining the unity of both Testaments. It rests upon the conviction that the Old Testament must be read as Christ and his disciples understood it—that is, as witnessing to himself as the fulfilment of the historical process of God's dealings with his ancient people. Christians are the people of the new covenant, and this covenant has not simply abolished the old, but has completed it and given it its true significance. It is the goal towards which the ancient promises of God and the process of his self-revelation in history pointed the way. The history of the covenant people, which is the story of the Bible, begins with the call of Abraham (a beginning to which the divine work in creation and the salvation of Noah are a preface) and is carried through to the inauguration of the new covenant in Christ, as the climax which invests the whole of the previous history with its full significance; so, also, it continues in the history of the Church as the true people of the covenant. The long perspective of biblical history can be discerned only in the light of the revelation of God in Christ. It is from this point that the records have to be re-read if their meaning is to be appreciated. Christ's exposition "in all the scriptures" of "the things

concerning himself" is the key to the Christian understanding of "Moses and all the prophets".

The various parts of Scripture must therefore be read as parts of a single whole of which Christ is the climax which confers upon it unity and significance. Nevertheless, this single whole is a process, and its culminating point is itself included in the process. Hence, though each part of Scripture must be read as a contributory member of an organic unit, it must not be dissociated from the particular stage in the historical process to which it properly belongs. We must appreciate the unity of Scripture, and understand, with Dr Dodd,[1] that "it would not be true of any literature which deserves to be called great, that its meaning is restricted to that which was explicitly in the mind of the author when he wrote"; but to do so is no excuse for failing to insist upon the exegesis of each part of it in the light of its original meaning in its own historical context. "Biblical theology" does not involve any depreciation of the results of historical criticism. The latter should in fact prepare the way for the fuller understanding of the unity of the historical process through which God has acted towards his people.

The typological method of exegesis, when properly applied, is essentially the recognition in our interpretation of Scripture of its character as the record of the continuous process of the acts of God. In the light of their climax in the Christian revelation, we can begin to discern, with the New Testament writers themselves, the pattern of that record, and, as its name implies, the function of typology is to trace that pattern from its first adumbrations in the Old Testament to its clear manifestation in the New. It is primarily a method of *historical* interpretation, based upon the continuity of God's purpose throughout the history of his covenant. It seeks to demonstrate the correspondence between the various stages in the fulfilment of that purpose.

To expect to find such a correspondence is entirely reasonable if we believe that the saving purpose of God which became fully manifested in Christ is identical with the divine purpose that operated in the history of his people from the beginning. We are then justified in looking for a consistent pattern in the biblical records and in the prophetic interpretation of history; the actual nature of that pattern becomes discernible in the light of the Gospel events towards which the process of God's activity moves through its various stages.

To some extent, indeed, the form of the pattern was already perceptible to the prophets of the Old Testament, even though they could see but a small portion of the whole. Deutero-Isaiah, in particular, looks back to the redemption from Egypt as the recapitulation of the great acts of God in Creation and the first victory over chaos; and both creation and redemption are, according to his prophetic vision, to be recapitulated anew in a future act of deliverance, a second Exodus from capitivity, and a renewal of creation after a second entry into the promised land. In the light of his prophetic

[1] *According to the Scriptures*, p. 131.

hope the seer sets the works of God in past history in their true perspective, and expresses in his typology the pattern of recapitulation or fulfilment which he discerns in them. For the Christian interpreter the picture is clearer. The prophets spoke to their own day, but the full significance of their sayings is intelligible only when we re-read them in the light of our Christian knowledge of the whole story of which they formed a part. We know the whole plot of the drama. The Servant poems are not to be read as direct predictions of Jesus, but the vision of the righteous Servant, even if it was referred by the prophet to the faithful remnant of Israel, was completely realized only when the Servant's role was enacted and fulfilled by our Lord, who personified the Remnant.

The early Church partly interpreted the pattern of biblical history by means of proof-texts or passages used as *testimonia* which it held to be direct predictions from the past, to whose fulfilment in the present it could point on the authority of eye witnesses. In so doing it incurred the danger of ignoring the reality of the historical process in which successive acts of God gradually prepared the way for Christ. Prophetic utterances were torn from their context within that process and applied without regard for their original significance on the lips of the prophets at the particular time when they were delivered. It is true that the prophets often uttered truths whose full range of meaning they could not themselves realize. It is also true, as Professor Dodd has convincingly shown,[1] that the primitive Church's *testimonia* were not usually mere isolated texts selected at random. The New Israel selected certain large portions of the scriptures as peculiarly its own. "These sections were understood as *wholes*, and particular verses or sentences were quoted from them rather as pointers to the whole context than as constituting testimonies in and for themselves."[2] Nevertheless, even within those large sections whose choice was determined by a true understanding of history there are not a few passages whose application seems to be forced and artificial, such as the correspondence discerned by Matthew (4. 15–16) between Is. 9. 1–2 and the beginning of our Lord's Galilaean ministry; and sometimes the correspondence rests only upon verbal similarities, almost unrelated to the subject-matter of a passage. Moreover, Professor Dodd admits the existence of some cases where the prophecies are "treated as a kind of pious fortune-telling".[3] He cites the Matthaen handling of Zech. 9. 9. In fact, the treatment of Old Testament passages as "oracles" or sacred riddles would appear to have affected the New Testament writers somewhat more extensively than Professor Dodd suggests, though not, of course, to anything like the extent to which it permeates the work of many later authors, such as Justin.

Some of the early Church's attempts to discern prophetic fulfilments are therefore historically legitimate; others are not. Yet it is hard to apply a criterion. When St Matthew refers Hosea's prophecy to the flight into Egypt and its sequel, it is arguable that he means us to conclude that the pattern of God's dealings with Israel is recapitu-

[1] Op. cit., pp. 82, 126. [2] Ibid., p. 126. [3] Ibid. p. 127.

lated and fulfilled in the story of the representative head of the new Israel, who sums up in himself the covenant people of God. The same correspondence between Jesus and Israel is brought to our notice elsewhere in the Gospels, as for example in the Temptation narrative, and, assuming the historicity of the flight into Egypt and the Temptations (and only on that assumption), the typology may be defended as legitimate and as a genuine aid to our understanding of the theme of Scripture as a whole. On the other hand, the prophecies, "In Rama was there a voice heard . . .", and "He shall be called a Nazarene", stand on a different footing. The murder of the Innocents cannot be described as in any sense a recapitulation of the carrying into captivity referred to by Jeremiah. There is no real correspondence in the historical pattern. The only point of contact between the prophecy and the supposed fulfilment is that on two successive occasions there was lamentation in approximately the same part of Palestine. The fact that the prophecy occurs in a section of the Scriptures which seemed to the early Church to be as a whole prophetic of the Gospel does not substantially alter this objection. The allusion to "Nazarene", even if we could be sure of its source, likewise fails to exhibit any genuine correspondence. Both texts are applied without regard for their proper meaning or their own place in the historical process which they are intended to illuminate. Their supposed fulfilment is read into Scripture, not read out of it as a necessary consequence of the pattern of God's activity. The meaning given to them "amounts", in Professor Dodd's words (which he does not apply to the particular passages under consideration), "to no more than an arbitrary reading into a passage of a meaning essentially foreign to it".[1]

The danger inherent in the use of prophecies is no less present in the attempt to discern the pattern of God's purpose in history in the record of events rather than in verbal prophecies; that is to say, there is a legitimate and an illegitimate use of typology as well as of prophecy.

As Christians we cannot read the Old Testament without perceiving that, for example, the theme of divine deliverance and restoration is repeated in the story of the Flood and the Ark, the Passover, the crossing of the Red Sea and the entry into Canaan, the Exile and the Return, until all these foreshadowings find their true character fully revealed in the saving events of the Gospel. Nor can we fail to recognize that Christ is typified by Adam, the head of humanity, whose disobedience Christ reversed, by Isaac the "beloved son" who is also the sacrificial victim, by the Passover lamb, by Moses the deliverer and lawgiver, and by the Servant of the Lord, for he was in fact all, and more than all, that these partially represented. We must also agree that the sign of Jonah who was cast into the abyss of Sheol, and raised to life so that the word of God might be proclaimed to Gentiles, pointed to Christ, as he himself explained.

The discernment of such types as these appears to follow naturally

[1] Op. cit., p. 133.

from the biblical conception of history. What was actually revealed in history was prefigured in the events of the Old Testament, which themselves partook to some extent of the character and efficacy of the Gospel events, because they were, so to speak, part of the same thread in the pattern of God's purpose.

Just as the acts of God in Christ were prefigured, and to some extent anticipated, in the Old Testament, so now they (together with their prefigurings in Scripture) are made effective and present after the event in the Church's sacraments and liturgy. They are, as it were, "post-figured" in the sacramental signs. We must not forget that the same vocabulary is used by the Fathers to denote both scriptural types and figures on the one hand, and sacramental signs on the other, at least until late developments in Eucharistic "realism" led to some reluctance to do this. Thus the bread from heaven which is Christ was prefigured in the manna, and since the sign partakes of, or conveys, the reality which it signifies, it must be regarded as in some measure actually made present in the manna (cf. 1 Cor. 19 1 ff.). It is made present to us in the "post-figuring" type or figure of the sacramental bread. Similarly the whole sequence of God's acts of creation, redemption, and restoration, from Noah and the Exodus to Christ's death and resurrection, are made effective to the believer in baptism, by which they are again typified.

The complex and impressive typological tradition of the early Church's liturgy is an excellent guide to the right use of typological exegesis, for the pattern of biblical history was enshrined in liturgy from a very early date. Outside the liturgical tradition, and apart from those basic elements in the historical pattern whose recapitulation in the work of Christ is unmistakably indicated by the New Testament writers or the recorded words of Jesus himself, it is extremely difficult to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate typology. The early Church failed, on the whole, to establish a criterion, badly as it needed one. The quest for a criterion is again confronting us as a most urgent task. Typological exegesis is a useful and attractive tool for the biblical theologian; but it is dangerously easy to misuse. It is the Church's traditional method, exercising an immense fascination on the devout imagination of Christians through the ages. Yet it can easily lead us to a fundamentally wrong conception of the nature of the Bible. Typology should be a by-product of the biblical theology of history, a mode of interpretation based on the conviction that, with all its diversity of authors, historical background, and theological understanding, the Bible has a single unifying theme. All too often it has been confused with, and passed over into, allegory; and allegory is founded upon a disregard of history. It ignores the true nature of the scriptural records. It treats the Bible not as the story of God's actual dealings with man but as a book of "oracles", parables, riddles, and dark sayings. Legitimate typology rests upon an historical foundation; allegory upon a quasi-Platonist view which sees the literal record of events as but a phenomenal husk which contains within itself, and disguises from ordinary perception, eternal truths discernible by the spiritual understanding.

On this hypothesis, the task of exegesis is that which Origen propounded. It is to penetrate the literal, historical, and sensible wrappings to the inner treasure of spiritual truth. The whole Bible becomes symbolical, and the diversity of its several parts and their proper context in history are ignored. Scripture becomes, so to speak, a boxful of jigsaw pieces. The ingenious interpreter can select indiscriminately any piece he chooses from the box and fit it into his pattern. Here, of course, the analogy breaks down, for the pattern of the puzzle is predetermined and each piece has its proper place, whereas the allegorist can construct his own picture as he goes along, cutting his pieces into any shape he fancies.

Pure allegory is easily recognizable. Philo's exegesis, and the unfortunate history of the interpretation of the Song of Songs from Origen and Gregory of Nyssa onwards, are its supreme examples. It may be edifying, and there may be a place for it in homiletics, but it is of no value for sound exegesis, however attractive it may be for the purpose of dealing with Tyconius' "immensa silva" of biblical passages which are not amenable to typology and whose literal sense is unexciting. It severs Christian truth from its historical roots as effectively as Marcion cut it loose. There is, however, a borderland between allegory and typology where it is very hard to establish a criterion of legitimacy. I can do no more than suggest certain pointers in its direction.

Typology must be based on history as the biblical writers interpret it. It must not disregard history. The Fathers of the Antiochene school can help us here against the allegorists of Alexandria. There must be a real identity between the type and its fulfilment. The correspondence between them must be clear and intelligible; the image must recognizably reproduce the character of the fulfilment; the pattern must be genuinely repeated; and, since we are dealing with divine revelation, there must be a theological correspondence between the two elements. Chrysostom affords a useful analogy when he compares a type with an artist's rough preliminary outline for a painting. The object portrayed, the "thing", is the same; yet it is at first but dimly and partially delineated and becomes fully apparent only when the sketch is overlaid by the completed picture.[1] An obscure correspondence must not be helped out by verbal trickery such as the Fathers employed (in this case in an attempt to embellish a genuine correspondence) when they made Isaac a type of Christ because his name means "laughter" and Christ is the source of happiness, or such as the frequent attempts of modern exponents of the method to bring out in their English paraphrases of the text verbal correspondences that are absent from the original.

A modern example of verbal and etymological jugglery is to be seen in Dr L. S. Thornton's *Revelation and the Modern World*.[2] On Jo. 3. 30 ("He must increase, but I must increase") he says: "As the stars wane before the sun, so the old order pales before the new. The

[1] *Hom.* 10. 2 *in Phil.* (276E). For a discussion of this passage and a full inquiry into patristic typology, see K. J. Woollcombe, *Le Vie Spirituelle*, February 1951, pp. 84 ff.

[2] P. 223.

imagery is highly relevant to the Elijah prophecy of Malachi 4. For here Elijah heralds the day of the Lord when 'unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise'. The sunrise, moreover, is to bring healing (cf. Is. 53. 5). So the reference to John as the 'lamp which burneth and shineth' (John 5. 35) follows upon a typical narrative of healing (5. 1–16), the connexion of Ἰησοῦς with ἴασις being a continual undertone of healing miracles in the New Testament." The first part of this typology may be sound, though the correspondence is much clearer in Dr Thornton's paraphrase ("As the stars wane . . ." etc.) than in the original. The latter part brings us into that dangerous territory between typology and allegory where parallels begin to be forced into the text by artificial playing with words instead of being naturally suggested by it.

Another instance of this erroneous method occurs in the same author's *The Dominion of Christ*,[1] where the word *paides*, used quite naturally of the Innocents as an alternative to *paidia*, is supposed to convey the meaning "servants" as well as "children" and so to indicate that these are prototypes of all those who are destined to be participators in the passion of the "Servant". In the same book we also read[2] that Simon Peter's name, Barjonah, indicates that he represents the "silly dove" (*jonah*) which is likened by Hosea to Israel. As that dove was caught and chastised and later restored, so will Peter fail and be restored again.

In such allegorism the reader is left at the mercy of any individual exegete with sufficient ingenuity to construct and solve artificial puzzles. The interpretation is wholly subjective and individualist, controlled neither by ecclesiastical tradition nor by any canons of exegesis whatever.

If the typological correspondences are not historically and theologically plausible, and if they are read into rather than out of the text, we ought to disregard them except perhaps as edifying illustrations for homiletic purposes. A type, however, should be more than a mere simile or edifying illustration. When the Fathers tell us that Christ's Godhead is typified by a fish-hook and his manhood by the bait, or that the red heifer of Leviticus is a type of Christ's earthly body, they are misusing the term "type".

Nor should we use the Old Testament to determine the significance of the New Testament fulfilment. The meaning of the reality transcends that of the shadow. The antitype must be used to illuminate the type. We must not turn to the Old Testament in order to read the New in its light; we should reverse that process. It is misleading to refer to the Levitical priesthood in order to define the priesthood of Christ or that of the Church which is derived from his. On the contrary, the real significance of the former in the pattern of sacred history is revealed by the latter. Yet this mistake has often been made, with serious results for Christian doctrine. Similarly the late Dom Gregory Dix argued from Old Testament types to a supposed sequence of initiatory rites in the primitive Church of which the

[1] P. 89. [2] P. 177.

former were to be understood as the foreshadowing.[1] But we must not infer the existence of a supposed antitype from the fact that a plausible type could be found for it if it existed. The danger in all this is that of subordinating the reality to the shadow and of bringing the Gospel into bondage to the Law. The admitted unity of the two Testaments does not render this danger unreal.

Finally, we must beware of the attempt to prove doctrinal theories by reference to obscure and artificial typology. Dr Thornton and others afford a notorious example of such an attempt in the early chapters of *The Apostolic Ministry*. The Anglican appeal to Scripture for the proof of doctrine embraces no appeal to such fanciful allegorism as is to be found in that book's attempt to deduce the nature of the apostolate from the simile of the vine in John 15, an exposition which is quite unable to bear the weight of doctrinal inference which is there laid on it.

If the appeal to Scripture is to be maintained in its proper sense, and Christian doctrine is to be set on a less unstable foundation than the private judgment of ingenious riddle-solvers, some attempt is urgently needed to establish a workable criterion for the legitimate use of the typological method, and so to smooth the path of biblical theology.

G. W. H. Lampe.

Challenge and Response

AN OUTLINE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE "CHRISTENDOM GROUP"

It is related of two of the most brilliant of this century's Balliol men, "Sandy" Lindsay and William Temple, that when seated together listening to a very abstruse speaker, Lindsay whispered to Temple, "I can't understand what he's saying; can you?" "Yes," replied Temple, "I can; but I can't understand what he's saying it *about*." There is a note of warning here for Christian sociologists. What matters is not only the truth and forcefulness of what we are saying, but the reality and immediacy of what we are saying it about. In the situation lies the challenge, and our response will be valid in so far as it is clearly related thereto. And it can only be so related in proportion as we can enter into that situation, seize on what is significant on it, and speak to that.

This can never be an easy task. For to succeed in it a group must strive first to overcome that recurrent inertia which quite naturally descends upon all bodies of people once they have sought to formulate their thinking, and all the more if they have done so to their own satisfaction. That satisfaction may conceivably be justified; but what is never justified is the assumption that the situation to which the formulation has been related will be obliging enough to stand still. Indeed what makes the task of the social student to-day so unprecedentedly difficult is not only the increasing complexity of his

[1] See *Confirmation or the Laying-on of Hands?*, 1936; and *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism*, 1946.

subject-matter, but the ever accelerated rapidity with which that kaleidoscopic phenomenon undergoes its subtle transformations. Religious thinkers are perhaps even more prone than others to be betrayed into static thinking; and this may be still more true of Christian social thinkers who derive from the Catholic tradition because of their well-founded awareness that theirs is in some sort a department of a "Philosophia perennis". There are truths in the Christian doctrine of Man and Society which will remain true though (perhaps under "atomic" provocation) the heavens fall. Yes, they *will* remain true, but will they remain clear? Are we who enunciate them revealing them as a direct response to the world's bewildered challenges? Unless we are, we are not doing our job.

Such general considerations may perhaps gain in force and interest if they are related to the development of a specific nucleus of sociological thinking. In what follows I shall be writing of what about twenty years ago came to be known as the "Christendom Group", though in fact it began to crystallize a dozen or so years before this, and has its remoter roots in the principles of the first Christian Socialists.

In the little gatherings initiated by Canon Widdrington at Paycocke's House, Coggeshall, in the first post-war years, 1919–21, the challenge to us appeared as twofold. On the religious side there was the clear need to reinforce the doctrinal basis of the "Christian social" effort, which had been gravely undermined by the all-too-humanist ethicalism of a progressive movement asserting a brotherhood of men who had lost the memory of their Father, and a Kingdom of God which had, albeit with the greatest courtesy, deposed its King. We heard a call for the "Return of Dogma", and we noted a renewed activity in the ecclesiastical circles which might seem to specialize in this direction. The efficient organizers of the Anglo-Catholic Congress marshalled their cohorts to fill the Albert Hall; but as we sat in the gallery we caught few echoes of anything that we could recognize as integral to a Catholic doctrine of nature and of man. A new word had conveniently arrived to describe what we felt about ; it seemed to us "introverted", turned in upon its altars, hearing no cry of *Ite, missa est* to go forth into the world to meet the world's needs and to illuminate its perplexities.

By 1922, when we had produced our first—very tentative and incomplete—formulation in the volume *The Return of Christendom*, we had no further need to deflate the world's utopian dreams, for the Bank of England, in less profound but more effective fashion, had anticipated us. As Montagu Norman, the Grey Eminence of every Prime Minister from Lloyd George to Neville Chamberlain, remarked, "the dogs bark but the caravan marches on". The covered waggon of Sound Finance jerked and bumped along from "Black Friday" to the General Strike, from World Depression to World Rearmament, with first one, then two, then three million unemployed trailing wearily behind. For our part we joined the irreverent dogs and barked lustily in all sorts of places, but most notably each summer from 1925 at the Oxford School of Sociology. We barked alike at

social philosophers who told us that the chief end of man was to be employed, and at economists who said that he should be content to be unemployed. We barked at those who sought to justify "poverty in the midst of plenty", and at those who contended that "plenty" was (as Mr Belloc suggested in another connexion) "all the human frame requires". We even barked at an archbishop when he professed to "trace the finger of God" in the moral capitulation summarized for ever in the word "Munich". All this obstreperousness not unnaturally irritated a great many people and was perhaps not altogether good for ourselves; we were indeed roundly denounced on one occasion as "the rudest group in the Church of England"—one critic even complained that we were rude to one another! It is the weakness of zealots that when the need is for "speaking the truth in love" they are apt to be better at struggling for the former than at exemplifying the latter. But I think it can be said that if we did not by any means "eliminate the negative" we did "accentuate the positive". In the twenties, led by Canon Widdrington, we emphasized and argued for our conviction that not only can there be a Christian sociology, authentic and distinctive, but that essential clues for it are discoverable in the Christendom of a pre-Reformation day and can be reinterpreted in a form "consonant with the needs of this age", as a favourite phrase of ours had it. Building upon this in the thirties, we added the affirmation especially characteristic of Dr Demant that if Christian social witness were to pass, as it should, "from ethics to sociology", its first criterion must be that of purpose. Social policies therefore need to be judged not by the benevolent intentions of those who propound them, or as an earnest of human goodwill, but according to their congruity with *God's* will for his creation, and with the essential nature of man, fallen but redeemed.

Here was the foundation for our social critique, which was elaborated from 1931 in our own journal, in the books of Drs Peck and Demant, and in more informal lucubrations of my own. If our tendency then was to relate criticism and suggestion too predominantly to economic factors, this was at least an attempt at a response to the very evident challenge of that frustrated time. But in the middle thirties two things happened. In the first place, we were suddenly and strikingly reinforced by a younger generation which combined exceptional theological insight with an alert sociological awareness. And just at this time the European sky darkened beneath the monstrous crow of totalitarianism. This was a challenge we seemed especially required and equipped to take up, and on a more fundamental ground than that of mere "social democracy". For "Christendom" thought, rooted in a pre-nationalist tradition, and schooled by such teachers as J. N. Figgis and A. J. Carlyle, was essentially "pluralist"; it knew that a Christian society must necessarily be a "communitas communitatum", and it saw in totalitarianism at once the logical culmination of secular pretensions and the desperate expedient of societies driving to disintegration by their defiance of a natural order. This was the moment when Berdyaev declared: "the hands of universal history are pointing to a fatal hour, that of twi-

light, when it is time to light our lamps and prepare for a night". For that night we did very consciously prepare, at Oxford; more intimately in small selected gatherings at "Moreton", St Leonards; and in the pages of *Christendom*, with the result that we can claim, I think, to have been better prepared than any other group, in the Church of England at any rate, first to take advantage of the vacuum created by the "phoney war", and then to stand at the disposal of the great Archbishop when in 1940 he virtually handed over the entire program of the Malvern Conference to our speakers. Two "formulations" followed: the "Christian Realm" document sponsored by the Church Union, still perhaps the most effective statement of fundamentals within its compass; and the more deliberate and elaborate project embodied in the work of the sixteen contributors to *Prospect for Christendom*, a volume which appeared, significantly enough, in the very week of Victory in Europe.

I hope there is no note of complacency or vainglory in my recollection of all this. We had plenty of faults as a group, which I need not perhaps particularize now further than to acknowledge some truth in the complaints of the obscurity and the jargon in which we were wont (it was alleged) to clothe our declarations. We were, I think, too esoteric; interested rather in satisfying ourselves of the precision of our statements than in communicating the essence of them to those who had not gone over all the ground with us. Certainly this was so often alleged against us that it seems likely that there was something in the charge. If we mishandled our opportunities then—and not everybody seems to think so, as witness Canon Roger Lloyd's generous tributes to us in his book on *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century*—we need not cry now over the spilt milk, for if such a group as ours is offered any opportunities to-day they will certainly be very different ones. We were, I am sure, right ten years ago to see the post-war situation as we did—though certainly with no undue optimism—as an opportunity in a constitutive sense, and to write in such a spirit. We had been "digging", in the Maurician sense, for twenty years; it was time to show that building might be begun, and how it should be. And we went "down to earth" in the literal sense, for our foundations. It was David Peck and Patrick McLaughlin who set on foot the Council for the Church and Countryside in the middle of the war, with the warm approval and evident understanding of both archbishops, in response to a plea to the Church from the livest set of rural writers and practitioners in the country. Here then in 1945 was a group which, starting as it were from scratch, with no prestige and virtually no money, had largely contributed to set on foot the Oxford Summer School of Sociology; founded a quarterly journal which lasted for twenty years; supplied a Director of Research for the Christian Social Council; in effect set up and staffed the Church Social Action Committee of the Church Union; taken a large share in the writing of four Reports for the Social and Industrial Commission of the Church Assembly, and was now seeking to relate the Church's social teaching to the almost wholly neglected rural community.

But we are now in the fifties, and the picture is very different. Two features, as far as the group's own work is concerned, are obvious and must be faced. In the first place, the fellowship from which all this effort proceeded is largely dispersed. This of course is not altogether to be regretted, for who can tell what rich infusion of the Church's intellectual life is resulting from the dispersal?

The other fact might appear as a judgment on us for failure to respond to the needs of the latest age, for it can hardly be said that a new generation has succeeded to those born around 1910, to put their elders in their places and meet with a new initiative the very different post-war circumstances which it should be better able than its seniors to perceive, enter into and confront.

At least we had never as a Group cherished any utopian illusions; we had no need of A. P. Herbert's salutary warning to the irrational optimists of the day:

> Let us never quite ignore
> That worlds are not *improved* by war.

Perhaps we had not foreseen any more clearly than others that a hot war would be immediately and almost automatically succeeded by a cold one. Yet even if we had, it is difficult to see what we could have done about it. For we had been writing and speaking of the constitutive doctrine and the positive responsibility of the Church, and here was a situation in which it was rather dissolution which seemed to threaten on almost every plane. Moreover, just at this moment the Church had lost the great leader who had in effect given us much of our opportunity, and himself voiced with incomparable effectiveness what we had sought to proclaim. For the many who did not go deeply into such matters it was Temple who seemed to embody all that was signified by "Malvern", and though in fact many of the more immediate reforms demanded there were implemented in the social policy bequeathed by the Coalition Government, the spirit of Christian prophecy which gave to that gathering its real significance did not survive his loss. As the scale and depth of Europe's spiritual and cultural crisis was revealed, a merely sociological prescription for such ills seemed altogether inadequate—as indeed much of what claimed to be "Christian socialism" in fact was. Many who rightly desired something deeper turned to a "theology of crisis" largely Protestant in inspiration and implicitly hostile to the very notion of a Christian sociology. Others turned to the plane of aesthetic expression, encouraged by new depths perceived or optimistically suspected there, and by a changed mood, at once realistic and in effect anti-secularist, with which, it might seem, the Faith could live, if not in open alliance, at least in friendly and fruitful symbiosis.

There should have been nothing to surprise us, and need not surely have been much to dismay us, in all this. It is always necessary for any Christian movement that is to remain authentically such to renew itself at its theological roots; we had in fact deliberately done so ourselves in two successive years at the Summer School in the middle thirties. Nor can any social movement be vital which loses its links

with all that is valid in the humanities as they seek to give expression to the cultural hungers and discoveries of an age. To speak of literature alone, a period in which an Eliot, a Charles Williams, a Graham Greene—even an Aldous Huxley and a Gerald Heard—are writing, is not one in which anybody deeply concerned with the plight of man as a social being can afford to disregard what the poet, the playwright and the story-teller have to teach him. Yet not all fruitful social impacts can be counted upon to come about as it were indirectly; not only must the sociological sphere remain in some sort necessarily distinct from that of theology and culture, but the serious Christian will always have his obligations in respect of it, if only to be aware of the significance of what is going on—or failing to go on—in it. There has assuredly been no loss from the explorations of those who have turned aside from sociological study for the examination of theology and aesthetics. But there has been a certain loss, I think, from the too frequent failure of these explorers to return to us from these excursions and tell us of the significance of what they have found. We should not fail to salute such attempts as have been made (for example at St Anne's House) to move towards a synthesis of Christian thought upon the cultural situation of our time. But even so, the effort to achieve a link-up of theology, philosophy and aesthetics with the political and social challenges of the age has enlisted less intelligent interest than it ought to have done. This is understandable, for such a link-up is apt to bring theoretical disquisitions down with a bump to the discouraging level of the actual, where so many deterministic forces seem at work to snatch the initiative out of our hands, and even out of the hands of those who have to direct the precarious fortunes of our country.

Nevertheless where there is challenge there must always be opportunity for response in the name of the faith. The problem facing such groups as ours may be broadly stated as how to pursue their constructive theme in due relation to what men may well feel to be a disintegrating situation, with full awareness of its so varied menace, yet remembering too how often not only have the world's hopes proved to be dupes but its fears revealed themselves to be liars. After all, even in an evil situation there are both good and less good ways of confronting it; some steps will be taken in any case, and those in the Catholic social tradition have standards by which they may judge of their wisdom and by which they may often be able to press for some more valid response. We must be on the watch to detect those social trends which are, whether deliberately or unconsciously, "denaturing" man; we can actively support and even inspire those efforts which are certainly being made here and there in our society "to reverse" (in Temple's suggestive phrase) "the reversal of the natural order". We can seek to discriminate, as most people are too lazy or too prejudiced to do, between what is valid and invalid in the complex experiment of the Welfare State. We can look for new opportunities of Christian vocation in the changing structure of industry (as for example for industrial chaplains, personnel managers, welfare workers and industrial psychologists), as also in the social ser-

vices. A very great deal will depend upon the inspiration and the spiritual insights with which such tasks as these are undertaken, and the understanding of man and society to which they are related. Perhaps it is in the fulfilment of such vocations that a specifically Christian impact is waiting to be made, as it was so notably made a quarter of a century ago (often under specifically Anglo-Catholic inspiration) in respect of Housing.

Space does not permit of any attempt to assess the value and extent of the influence which the Group (now more formally constituted as an "Association") has exercised, whether upon those Anglo-Catholic circles to which it is ecclesiastically affiliated, or upon Christian sociological thought generally. On such a matter the present writer will hardly be supposed to present an impartial judgment, but perhaps he may be allowed to say that he is not at all disposed to make any considerable claims in this respect. Nor does space allow of any but the briefest suggestion as to the tasks which offer the most urgent challenge and demand the most conscientious response from such a Group as this. But as seen in the broadest outline, there would seem to be two such. In the first place, the need is for the confrontation of that scientific outlook which is the most characteristic feature of the mind of the age by an understanding of social problems inspired by a fully Christian doctrine of man. We have, in short, to go beyond Christian sociology to what can only be called Christian anthropology. Here the way has been in one direction pioneered in a recent book by a member of the Group, Dr J. V. L. Casserley's *Morals and Man in the Social Sciences*. This little volume, though perhaps rather slight for its formidable theme, and lacking an adequately systematic presentation of the subject, is yet full of original thinking, and though authentically Christian in its approach, does meet the social scientist on his own ground and with due respect for the legitimate "autonomy" of his studies.

In regard to the other matter which would seem to call for exploration, it is a book from across the Atlantic, Dr Richard Niebuhr's *Christ and Culture*, which perhaps most specifically starts the ball rolling. Members of the Christendom Group have long been accustomed to think and speak of themselves as Christian Humanists. But probably all of them would be ready to admit that the phrase is one which is often used in a very superficial way, and that the problems involved here need a good deal more clarification than they have ever received from Christian thinkers. For reasons not difficult to discern, yet too seldom sufficiently pondered, the great spiritual and cultural challenge implicit in the Renaissance went, as it were, by default; its issues were never faced, and to this day the Church has not clearly known—or seemingly much cared to know—where she stands in the matter. In what sense is human culture, and especially its aesthetic expression, rightly autonomous? In what sense (if any) does it "lie under sin" and to this extent form part of that "world" which the Christian must renounce? A Group which has derived so much (its critics might say "too much") of its inspiration from the thirteenth century might seem especially called upon to confront an

issue so clearly emergent then, yet, however understandably, so evidently set aside. Whether its members can widen their imagination and strengthen their resources to respond with any adequacy to challenges like these we must wait for the future to reveal.

MAURICE B. RECKITT.

Great Pastors—VI. Thomas Wilson

IT is customary to associate the eighteenth century with a decay in religion and to regard it as a time when Reason was the arbiter in matters of belief, when pluralism and non-residence were rampant, and when the clergy thought mainly of fees and preferment. It is always a dangerous thing to bring a railing accusation against any particular period in the history of the Church, and until our own age can produce a William Law, a Bishop Butler, or a Samuel Johnson, we are not in a position to throw stones. And to these notable names should be added that of Thomas Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man from 1697 to 1755.

Thomas Wilson was the youngest son in a family of seven, five boys and two girls. He was born in the picturesque village of Burton in Wirral, Cheshire, on 20 December, 1663. His father was probably a small yeoman farmer, if we may judge by the size of his house, which is still carefully preserved. Thomas owed a great deal to his maternal uncle, Dr Sherlock, Rector of Winwick, Lancs, who took him to live with him in his rectory and educated him himself until he was seventeen. It was probably through his influence that the boy obtained a free place from the Archdeacon of Chester at the King's School in that city, for Winwick was then in the Chester diocese and the dean and chapter, of which the archdeacon was a member, were by their statutes bound to give free places to twenty-four King's Scholars. Wilson remained at the King's School until he was eighteen and then proceeded to Trinity College, Dublin, where he read medicine. Just at this impressionable age he became very friendly with Prebendary Michael Huetson of Kildare Cathedral, with the result that he forsook medicine and was ordained deacon on St Peter's Day 1686, and became his uncle's curate at Winwick. It was not until October 1689 that he was ordained priest by Nicholas Stratford, Bishop of Chester, in his private chapel, now part of the cathedral building. He continued at Winwick until 1692, when he became private chaplain to Lord Derby at Knowsley. Five years later his patron "forced him" to become Bishop of Sodor and Man, where he remained for the rest of his life, refusing any preferment. He died on 7 March, 1755, at the great age of 92, having been bishop fifty-eight years. Such in brief outline is the life history of this remarkable man, who, in spite of the obscure corner of the field in which he laboured, has by reason of his saintly personality, communicated to us by his writings, left his mark upon the Church of England for all time.

The diocese of Sodor and Man, containing at that time only seventeen parishes, was separated from England by a dangerous sea voyage,

so that there was little incentive to its bishop to indulge in frequent periods of non-residence, even if his conscience would have allowed him to do so, which it certainly would not. From the very outset of his ministry he set his face against the two evils that were rampant in the Church of his day, pluralism and non-residence. In the resolutions he made at his ordination to the priesthood we find—"Thirdly, I resolve never to accept of two Church livings with cure of souls (if such should ever be my choice) though never so conveniently seated. Fourthly, I resolve that whenever it shall please God to bless me with a parish and a cure of souls, I will reside upon it myself, and not trust to a curate that which ought to be my own particular care." These resolutions were put to the test in 1693, when Lord Derby offered his chaplain the living of Baddesworth in Yorkshire to be held in conjunction with his chaplaincy, "which I refused", Wilson writes, "being inconsistent with a resolution I made against non-residence".

A bishop in those days was a man of considerable power, if he liked to use it, for his jurisdiction extended over the moral conduct of his people. The churchwardens, in England as in the Isle of Man, had to present any parishioners guilty of misconduct, especially sexual misconduct, and they were tried in the bishop's court, the punishment being public penance, unless commuted to a fine, and in the last resort excommunication and imprisonment by the civil authorities. Penance consisted in standing out in church in a white sheet and confessing the sin which had been committed, but in the Isle of Man penance very often had to be done in more than one parish church and in exceptional cases in the market-place also. This ecclesiastical discipline was still in force in England in the eighteenth century, but it was losing its power. In the Isle of Man, on the other hand, among a more backward and primitive people, it was still in full swing, and Bishop Wilson, driven on by his conscience and sense of duty, made full use of the moral weapon which he found ready to hand. And indeed in that little community some such discipline would be needed if Christian morality was to be preserved.

Discipline, then, was put in the forefront of the bishop's pastoral work, but he did not exercise it for its own sake, but for the reformation of the offender; he always remitted the remainder of a sentence if he found that the culprit appeared penitent. One of his first acts was to abolish fines in lieu of penance and so put everybody, rich and poor alike, on the same level. Thus when no less a person than the wife of the Governor came before his court and was convicted of slandering another woman she was ordered not indeed to stand in a sheet, but to make public confession of her sin on pain of imprisonment. It will be conceded that the bishop had courage. The Governor retaliated by claiming immunity from episcopal jurisdiction for all his family and his officials, and a few months later illegally fined the bishop £50 for infringing Lord Derby's prerogative. On the bishop's refusal to pay he was actually imprisoned for contempt of court with his two vicars-general in damp and dark cells in Rushen Castle, where he remained for two months until his appeal to the Privy Council

could be heard and judgment given in his favour. The bishop's attitude of mind is disclosed in a Pastoral Letter which he addressed to his clergy on the third day of his imprisonment:

> Though our persons are confined in this place, yet our affection for you, and our concern for the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made us overseer, and our prayers for both are at full liberty. . . . I beg you will be more than ordinarily diligent in discharging the several duties of your sacred calling; this will be the best testimony of your affection for us. And, I beseech you, let no unworthy thoughts enter into your hearts, nor unbecoming words come out of your mouths, against those that have given us this trouble. If we suffer for righteousness' sake, that is, for doing our duty, it will turn very much to our account. And if we have been mistaken in any thing, there are proper judges superior to us all, who will be able to clear up these difficulties to the satisfaction of all good men and lovers of peace.

The people's response was such that the bishop used to say in after years that he "never governed his diocese so well as in the time of his imprisonment". But enough of discipline, which in Keble's biography occupies a disproportionate amount of space. By way of contrast we will turn to a Charge which the bishop delivered to his Convocation in 1714, where he dwells on the importance of family prayers, and insists that the catechism shall be taught properly in the schools of the island so that the children are made to understand the *meaning* of what they learn by heart. He then notes that there are some parishes which have not put forward any Confirmation candidates for the past three years, and warns his clergy that he will not allow unconfirmed persons "to be admitted not only to the Sacrament but also to Matrimony or to stand sureties for others" [in Baptism]. Then he adds, "I have been at the charge of purchasing for every parish a book of excellent Devotions, which I do earnestly recommend to your practice." This was his Uncle Sherlock's *Practical Christian*, to which the bishop had prefixed a short account of the author's life, and from which we can see how greatly Wilson was indebted to and influenced by his uncle.

The laity had been already provided for, for in 1707 the bishop wrote a book for them entitled *The Principles and Duties of Christianity*, though it was commonly called "The Manx Catechism", for it was catechetical in form and the bishop had it translated into the vernacular. In 1733 his son persuaded him to publish his *Short Introduction to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, but most of his devotional writings were published after his death, including, of course, his *Sacra Privata*, which was obviously written for his own use and not intended for publication. Here in his prayers and meditations is revealed the heart of one whose life was hid with Christ in God, and we are able to perceive the source of his courage and his power. Many of his reflections would repay study to-day. For example, "A preacher should accustom himself to give a practical turn to everything. He that leaves it to his hearers to apply what he has said leaves to them the greatest part of his duty."

Mention has been made of the schools of the island. The bishop in the canons which he issued in 1703, and to which he obtained the

assent of his clergy, had laid down that there was to be a "petty school" in every parish at which attendance was to be compulsory. This provision of schools was not so big an undertaking as it seems to us to-day, accustomed as we are to our modern palatial and expensive buildings. A teacher and a room to teach in was all that was demanded. Nor did the good bishop forget his native village, for we read: "1724. This year I built a school-house at Burton in Wirral, which cost me £120", and he endowed it with land worth £20 a year. It may well be asked where the money came from for all this, and the answer is that a good deal of it came out of the bishop's own pocket. In days when it was possible, and indeed expected, that a clergyman should enrich himself and his family by the cure of souls Wilson never forgot that he was but a steward of the riches that came his way. On becoming Lord Derby's chaplain and receiving "a temporal income above my hopes" [£50] he decided that the tenth which he had hitherto devoted to pious uses was not enough and that in future he would give a fifth. In 1716 he dedicated three-tenths of his income from rents to the same object, and in 1718 he increased this to four-tenths. After his release from imprisonment and the appeal which followed it, he wrote in *Sacra Privata*, "I made the above dedications when I had enough and to spare. It has now pleased God to suffer me to fall into an expensive law-suit in defence of the discipline and jurisdiction of the Church." We expect him to say that he must therefore withdraw some of his money from "charity", but no. He continues, "He is the same great and good God, who can either shorten my troubles or lessen my expenses, or make good my losses in another life. In confidence of which and as a testimony of my firm faith in him, I do for the future dedicate *five*-tenths of my rents ecclesiastical to pious uses, and the rest as before." Further, he refused the wealthier see of Exeter, which George I offered him to help him to pay his legal costs, and when in after years he was received at the Court of George II, and Queen Caroline said, "See here, my lords, is a bishop who does not come for a translation," he replied, "No, indeed, an it please your Majesty. I will not leave my wife in her old age because she is poor."

The *Dictionary of National Biography* sums up Bishop Wilson's character in a way that cannot be bettered. It says his "rare unselfishness gives lustre to a life of fearless devotion to duty and thrifty benevolence . . . and his strictness joined with his transparent purity, his uniform sweetness of temper and his self-denying charities, drew to him the affectionate veneration of those to whom he dedicated his life."

Bibliography.—The standard biography is that by John Keble in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (1863), incorporating a good deal of the two previous Lives, by Cruttwell in 1781 and by Stowell in 1819. Wilson's own works were published by J. H. Parker in six volumes in 1860.

Sacra Privata was last published in the Library of Devotion (Methuen) in 1903 and is now out of print.

R. V. H. Burne.

In Defence of Immortality

"It is a doctrine not of the immortality of the soul but of resurrection." In these words Dr E. G. Selwyn sums up a thesis which is fast becoming a vested interest in the world of theological scholarship.[1] The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is not, he adds, "to be found in the New Testament",[2] and he regards Pope Leo X as seriously misguided in daring to define it against the Averroistic philosophers of Padua and elsewhere.[3] He puts forward a number of reasons for this judgment, including the distinctively philosophical origin of the doctrine of immortality, and its responsibility for some of the "most fearful consequences" of the doctrine of eternal punishment.

An even stronger line is taken by Professor J. V. Langmead Casserley is his latest book, *The Retreat from Christianity in the Modern World*.[4] In dealing with one of Mr Fred Hoyle's misunderstandings of Christian doctrine, Dr Casserley approaches the problem of immortality in an interesting way:

> The problem of whether or not it is possible for man to transcend and conquer death he [Hoyle] confuses with the question whether a part of man, called his "mind", has within it some inherent property which gives it the power to survive the dissolution of the body. He doubts whether it has, and so, I venture to think, would any competent Christian theologian. The Christian belief is certainly a belief in the full mortality of man—and, equally certainly, not a belief that some one part of human nature is inherently immortal. The problem for the Christian is whether God can and will revive mortal man, and lift him above time and make him a partaker of eternal life.

The comments that follow are inspired by the suspicion that Mr Hoyle is not alone in his confusion. They are intended simply to suggest certain distinctions which either the Dean of Winchester or Professor Casserley or both have failed to make, at least explicitly. Once they *are* made, however, the theological and philosophical case against immortality becomes rather less plausible.

(1) The phrase "the natural immortality of the soul", used by Dr Selwyn, conceals a dangerous ambiguity. (*a*) It may stand for the doctrine of the divinity of the soul, expressed in various ways in Orphism, Platonism and Gnosticism, but criticized by early Christian philosophers, such as Justin Martyr,[5] and obviously contradicted by the biblical doctrine of creation. (*b*) The phrase may also stand, however, within the context of faith in the sovereign Creator, who holds all souls in life, for the intrinsic incorruptibility of the soul, contrasted with the changeability of matter. This is implied in the text of Matt. 10. 28, which Dr Selwyn ignores: "Be not afraid of them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Here the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, subject only to divine omni-

[1] Theology, January 1953, p. 16. [2] Ibid., p. 15.
[3] Cf. Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, No. 738.
[4] Longmans, 1952, p. 24. [5] *Dial. c. Tryph.*, 5.

potence, is plainly indicated, and it is not particularly relevant to note, with Montefiore and J. Weiss, that "this distinction between 'body' and 'soul' is rather Greek than Hebrew".[1]

This essential contrast between soul and body is expressed by Irenaeus, when he distinguishes the flesh, "which dies and is dissolved", from the soul, to which this cannot happen, "because it is the breath of life".[2] Here the natural mutability of the material is set over against the permanence of the spiritual. If our doctrine of God is adequate, we need not fear to make this affirmation about the human spirit. Only a feeble theology will seek to glorify God, or safeguard his majesty, by denying the wonders of his creation. Once we recognize that the immortality attributed to the soul by many a "competent Christian theologian" (at least in the past) is a dependent immortality, there is no reason to deny its glory, in contrast with the transitoriness of all visible things. Nor need we see in the doctrine of immortality a demonic force, driving us to make indefensible pronouncements concerning the eternity of punishment. Given the total dependence of all contingent beings on their Creator, the idea of the natural indissolubility of the soul has no obvious implications in this area of thought.

(2) Again, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul may be interpreted as a maximum or as a minimum statement of the Christian hope. The distinction is effectively put by the Bishop of Durham:

> In the Platonist doctrine of immortality the body dies, but the soul continues its life. Thus, really and essentially, there is no death for that aspect of man that is deemed to be of eternal importance; the truth is that "in the sight of the unwise they *seem* to have died". Very different is a belief that the continuing life of the soul by itself is a maimed and incomplete life, that death is real with no semblance attaching to it, that Resurrection is the raising from out of death of a life that will be as rich and richer in the unity of soul and body than the life that existed previous to death.[3]

As Dr Ramsey suggests, the doctrine of the Platonists and their Orphic mentors presents immortality as the maximum expectation; indeed, it should be added that these thinkers looked upon the escape from the body as desirable. The traditional Christian doctrine, on the other hand, thinks of simple immortality as a bare minimum, and portrays the discarnate soul as yearning for renewed union with the body. At the same time, it stresses this minimal immortality, as the principle of personal continuity, apart from which identity through death and resurrection would be incomprehensible.

The opponents of immortality have not produced a coherent alternative solution of this problem, but have appealed to a sheer miracle, which assumes an occasionalist doctrine of personal identity, and for that reason can hardly commend itself to theologians who are not prepared to retreat into frank irrationality. Dr Casserley appeals, in his affirmation of the "revival of personality", to this miraculous occasionalism, against Mr Hoyle's attack on the nominal-

[1] C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, Vol. II (Macmillan, 1909), p. 583.
[2] *Adv. Haer.*, V, vii, 1.
[3] A. M. Ramsey, *The Resurrection of Christ* (Bles, 1945), p. 34.

istic doctrine of "mind". Has he any reason, however, for supposing that such blunt dogmatism will be any more effective apologetically than the traditional doctrine? Regardless of the difficulties inseparable from the attempt to make any philosophical argument intelligible to a positivistic age, we must surely try to defend the philosophical position which Dr Casserley too readily surrenders as hopeless. The doctrine of immortality is not, it should be emphasized, a mere philosophical intrusion into Christian doctrine. On the contrary, it is a principle of philosophical anthropology strictly correlative to the Christian doctrine of eternal life, and to the logical demands of the latter. In these circumstances, we cannot allow ourselves to be swayed by some allegedly diametrical opposition between the "Hebraic" doctrine of man, rather tendentiously defined, and identified with the truth of the biblical faith, and a "Greek" doctrine somewhat expansively reconstructed. The insights even of "Platonic" or "idealistic" philosophy need to be refined and clarified, rather than arbitrarily negated. As Dr Casserley pointedly observes, there is something dubious in the

> abundance of semi-philosophical treatises . . . in which some philosophical idea or other is calmly set on one side merely on the ground that it is "not biblical"—as though such an assertion could settle any philosophical issue, even for a Christian philosopher.[1]

(3) The philosophical problem itself, which Dr Casserley justifiably regards as an acute one, could be handled more satisfactorily if we distinguished the nominalistic doctrine of *mind* as mere consciousness from the richer doctrine of the *soul* more commonly expounded by Christian thinkers. To Ambrose, for example, the soul is "life", the vitalizing principle of the human composite, essentially contrary to death.[2] To Thomas Aquinas, nine centuries later, the soul is the "actuality" of the body, the principle by whose *esse* the body exists as a living human organism.[3] It is most misleading to treat this full doctrine of the soul as dynamic principle of life as though it were equivalent to the denatured post-Cartesian doctrine of mind. As a contemporary American philosopher expresses it:

> The modern psyche is the mind or consciousness, and the conception of the organization of the organism has ceased to be employed. This is a very grave omission. It makes the dualistic error of nominalism possible, and it robs psychology of much explanatory value, leading to contradictions and confusions galore.[4]

It is one thing, then, to defend the notion of mind as a mere reflection in consciousness of the elements of the physical world, and quite another thing to affirm the existence of the immortal soul. The latter is at once the most satisfactory philosophical explanation of the life and behaviour of the human organism, and the basis of that continuous personal identity without which the hope of eternal life is mean-

[1] Casserley, op. cit., pp. 75 f.
[2] *De bono mortis*, 9, 42 (*C.S.E.L.*, Vol. 32, p. 739).
[3] *De anima*, q. un., art. 1, ad 1m, quoted by E. Gilson, *Le Thomisme*, 5th ed. (Vrin, 1948), p. 277, n. 1.
[4] James K. Feibleman, *The Revival of Realism* (University of North Carolina Press, 1946), p. 314.

ingless. "No partial salvation", writes Gustave Thibon, "could be sufficient for man: the resurrection of the body is a dogma that follows necessarily from the immortality of the soul."[1] It is, I believe, even more fundamentally true that the dogma of the resurrection of the body is unintelligible apart from the doctrine of immortality.

E. R. Fairweather.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. G. W. H. Lampe is Professor of Theology in the University of Birmingham.

Mr Reckitt is the author of *Maurice to Temple: a century of the social movement in the Church of England*, etc.

The Ven. R. V. H. Burne is Archdeacon of Chester.

Dr Fairweather is Associate Professor of Dogmatic Theology and Ethics at Trinity College, Toronto.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE EUCHARIST AND THE HEAVENLY MINISTRY OF OUR LORD

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I very much appreciate the spirit of Canon Balmforth's comments on my article on *The Eucharist and the Heavenly Ministry of our Lord*, but I am not convinced. To start from one of his final points, I asked for a moratorium on the word "plead" not because it is forensic but because it is ambiguous, concealing two widely different meanings. Those who have proved one are apt to think that the other is also proved. I find similar ambiguities in Canon Balmforth's article, e.g. where he writes that our Lord's "humanity was and is the humanity offered to the Father in perfect obedience". This is true if it means that the humanity which our Lord now bears is that in which he once for all was offered for our sins. But Canon Balmforth assumes that this is the same as saying that the humanity once offered for our sins is even now being offered. This is a disguised assumption in his premiss of the idea he is setting out to prove. It is an assumption which he makes repeatedly, but he fails to produce any evidence from Scripture to justify the idea that our Lord is eternally offering the sacrifice of Calvary to the Father.

I think that it is this assumption which has prevented him from doing justice to my discussion of the relevant Scripture passages. It comes out very clearly in his argument that to "remember" Christ in the Eucharist is to remember (among other things) "the fact that the sacrifice *is* offered by the Son to the Father" (italics mine). What is

[1] *What God Has Joined Together* (Hollis and Carter, 1952), p. 24.

the justification for the present tense? Is there any place in Scripture where our Lord's sacrifice for sin is spoken of as now continuing? It is hard to see how Canon Balmforth can claim the support of Hebrews for the idea that "the sacrifice of Calvary is offered by Christ to the Father whenever the Eucharistic oblation is made by the Church" in face of such passages as Heb. 10. 12, "When he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever he sat down . . .", or 7. 25, "This he did [i.e. offered up sacrifice] once for all, when he offered up himself."

Perhaps the hidden rock on which this discussion has foundered is that the essence of atonement, so it seems to me, is not merely the self-oblation of our Lord, which is an eternal fact in the mutual self-giving of the Trinity, but that he bore the judgment of man's sins. These were committed in time and the atonement for them was made in time. The sacrifice has been offered and accepted. It was final and complete, and is therefore eternally valid. There is no need now to offer it to the Father but rather to apply it to men.

The further argument that, since we are given Christ's life, "when we offer ourselves we cannot but offer Christ" is deceptively simple. It makes the distinction between the Creator and the created, Christ and his body, less fundamental than that between the Father and the Son. The truth may come out more clearly in the analogous case of the Creation. There too all life is of Christ and in Christ (Col. 1. 18; John 1. 1–4). But when man offers creation or any part of it to the Father, does anyone suppose that he is thereby offering Christ? Infinitely closer though the relationship between the Creator and the created becomes in the new creation, the distinction still remains. The relationship is never one of absorption or of complete identity. He is the Saviour and we the saved, a distinction which is not obliterated even when we are in him and he in us. This in no way contradicts the biblical imagery of the body of Christ, which includes both the identity of Christ with the Church as his body and his distinction from it as head over the body. It is therefore a false logic which objects that the offering of the body and not the head involves "an impossible dichotomy". The dichotomy is the same as that involved in speaking of a body "growing up in all things into him which is the head" (Eph. 4. 15). The objection not only falls foul of the actual biblical use of the body imagery by treating it as a simple rational concept to be consistently worked out. It is also inconsistent with other biblical images of the Church, e.g. the bride.

It is of course only possible for the Church to offer herself to the Father in virtue of the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ, not through any merits of her own. We can only make this offering not in any strength of our own but in that of the living Christ who died to "open the kingdom of heaven to all believers" and lives to bring us to the Father, giving us by adoption and grace a share in the fellowship of the blessed Trinity which he enjoys by his own nature as the eternal Son of God. In the Holy Communion, therefore, we neither "perform a sacred drama for the edification of men" nor do we offer the sacrifice of Calvary to the Father. But rather God in Christ draws near to impart to his people "remission of our sins and all other

benefits of his passion", so enabling us to "offer ourselves a living sacrifice" in the power of the Holy Spirit, and drawing us into the fellowship of the blessed Trinity.

Yours faithfully,

W. M. M. F. Scott.

St Aidan's College,
Birkenhead.

READERS AND DEACONS

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

How grateful one is for the printing of that article by Mr Cobham so headed, for the airing that it gives to the demand for the declericalization of the Church, even of the Church of England. Amongst Romans the meanest clerk, if he can do it, is expected to sing or read the Epistle. Yet the newly proposed English canon 91 demands special authorization by the diocesan for a licensed reader to do this. Such red tape and distrust of the parish clergy is infuriating. We are used to laymen reading both lessons at Mattins and Evensong. Why should they not do so in the similar rite that immediately preludes the eucharistic act? Lay clerks sung both Epistle and Gospel in various cathedrals in the days of Charles I. The prelate Laud took steps to stop it. To-day in parishes where there is a deacon, often even he is not entrusted by the curate with the reading of the Gospel. Some declericalization of the Communion is a specific part of a healthy decentralization of the Church. Is it really clear that the diocesan and not the parochial pastor is always the best person to preside at a Confirmation? Rome has said No to this in principle. On account of our past perhaps the next step here is for each act of presbyteral Confirmation to require the express delegation of the diocesan. If it is right, desirable, to delegate where there is competence to fulfil the functions in question, the bishops as organs of the Spirit-possessed Church should not fail to take the initiative in the matter. Free-churchmen may well find it hard to overcome a distaste for episcopacy while the bishops of the Church of England show no signs of desiring modification of such autocratic powers as they acquired in 1838 for the summary revoking of licences granted to the unbeneficed. Again in reference to the new canon 64 surely something less than the written permission of the diocesan would be sufficient for a locum when one goes for a holiday including more than one Sunday. This could be settled by notifying the local dean of one's intended deputy, and he could warn one if one had got hold of someone not in Crockford or clearly scandalous.

To come to Mr Cobham's suggestion of permanent deacons, the Church of England has always had a few permanent deacons as lifelong members of the regular highly trained ministry. We might do with some, if not many, more of them. In addition to such we might live to welcome subdeacons, not as a minor order of lifelong commitment, but an office or function in the Church like warden, coun-

cillor, verger, churchworker, missioner, reader, which can be exersized for a time with local or diocesan recognition and licence, which when ended leaves no mark of permanent status behind it. Certainly the administration of both elements at Communion along with other functions could well be committed to such subdeacons, both for the sake of the real nature of the Church and also for practical convenience. The recognition and exercise of new offices among us must belong to the common life in the Body of Christ, not to the relics of the mirroring of the imperial administration which has infected so greatly our vitals. Mr Cobham's program is a cautious beginning in envisaging the declericalization, decentralization, of the Church of God, as extant in the Church of England. There is no doubt hunger and need, though but moderate hope, for more thorough reformation than either he or I have been suggesting.

Bene vale in Renovante,

LINCOLN. ROBERT P. SYMONDS.

BOOK REVIEWS

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. Volume I. By Paul Tillich. Nisbet. 25s.

It is a source of great delight to many people, who have long envied his students, that Professor Tillich's system of theology has now been made available to readers as well as to hearers.[1] They were aware that there was a system behind the many illuminating observations and analyses presented in previously published essays but could discern its outlines only dimly; they felt that there must be more satisfactory answers to the questions such essays raised in their minds than those at which they guessed. For such folk, as well as others for whom this volume will be their first introduction to Tillich's thought, the reading of *Systematic Theology* can be a great voyage of discovery into a rich and deep, an inclusive and yet elaborated, vision and understanding of human life in the presence of the mystery of God. To be sure, this first volume still leaves the reader with anticipations, problems and questions, for he must await the unfolding in the promised further volume of the second great theme of theology, the meaning of Christ and salvation. He learns from what is said here that Tillich is undertaking to develop the meaning of salvation less as forgiveness of sin and as redemption from death than as participation in the *New Being*, in which the disruption, conflict, self-destruction, meaningless, and despair of human life is overcome. But this great version of the Christian theme is only indicated here. Problems remain, not only because the work is incomplete, but because it is never easy to think the thoughts of any first-rate thinker after him; to think with Tillich requires arduous, repeated, and continuous effort. This is not a book that having been read once becomes a part of the reader's mind. Passages must be marked and mulled over, references made

[1] This review is reproduced from the *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* with the editor's permission.

back and forth; more light must be expected to break forth from these words at second and third reading. This is meant as high praise, though teachers who require quantitative reading reports and editors who are interested only in what running men can read will not recognize it as such.

If the second great theme of theology, the meaning of Christ and salvation, remains to be developed, this first volume does express in many formulations the first theme—the meaning of God. What makes it *great* theology is that the sense of God in it is great, and that Tillich's God is great. As one reads one is reminded of Santayana's famous statement about Spinoza: "When people tell us that they have the key to all reality in their pockets, or in their hearts, that they know who made the world, and why, or know that everything is matter, or that everything is mind—then Spinoza's notion of the absolutely infinite . . . may profitably arise before us. It will counsel us to say to those little gnostics, to those circumnavigators of being: I do not believe you; God is great." Tillich's God is not a being which exists or about whom the question can be significantly raised whether he exists. For Tillich is speaking of Being, of the Ground of being, of the Power of being. He is speaking of the "I am that I am", of the God of Augustine and Luther and Edwards. "A theology which does not dare to identify God and the power of being as the first step toward a doctrine of God", he says, "relapses into monarchic monotheism." . . . "It is as atheistic to affirm the existence of God as to deny it. God is being-itself, not *a* being." In seeking to point to the Power of being which precedes all existence Tillich analyses the concepts of being with great skill and insight; yet he never seeks to reduce the mystery of being to conceptual terms. Ontologists, this reviewer assumes, will find in Tillich's existentialist analysis of the ontological concepts a very instructive and perhaps the most original feature of this work; though on this point the present reviewer is incompetent to speak. He can only be grateful for the illumination thrown on the polarities of individualization and participation, dynamics and form, freedom and destiny, being and non-being, finite and infinite, and as theologian admire the skill with which these categories are then employed in setting forth the meaning of God.

The discussion of *Being and God* is preceded, as is necessary in a systematic theology, by an introductory methodological section and by an extensive discussion of the problems of *Reason and Revelation.* In both of these the highly systematic character of the work, preciseness in critical analysis, synthetic grasp and constructive ability, are exhibited to an uncommon degree. The interpretation of reason, with its criticism of the modern tendency to substitute mere *techne* for that deep activity of human life which the Greeks called *nous,* and of revelation, with its description of the place of mystery, ecstasy, and miracle, of the relations of preparatory and final revelation, are most helpful. In this section no less than in the last Prof. Tillich's great ability to combine philosophical and theological inquiry comes to full exhibition. He fully carries out his design, stated in the preface, "to present the method and structure of a theological system

written from an apologetic point of view and carried through in continuous correlation with philosophy." As philosopher he raises the ultimate questions of reason, as theologian he finds the answers to the questions in revelation, but the questions have not been set up artificially as is so often the case when this approach is made. Tillich is too serious a reasoner and too honest a believer for that sort of procedure.

It is apparent that a work with such a purpose should be judged solely in the light of its achievement of the intention, and not as a systematic theology which seeks first of all to understand what we believe and thus to be designed for the edification of the Church, in the best sense of both words. To compare Tillich's work with Barth's, for instance, would be beside the point, since they are directed toward different ends and employ wholly different methods. The work before us is, indeed, highly systematic, methodical, and structured; yet at the same time so condensed (to indulge in the comparison we have just eschewed) that it never leaves the student with the impression that the author has spared himself the final pain of seeking the exact formulation his thought requires. It is consistently apologetic in a kind of evangelical sense, being directed, as all of Tillich's writings seem to be, not to the cultured among the despisers of religion but to the lost souls of modern men. It is always irenic in its apologetics, seeking to persuade rather than to condemn and to do justice to the truth in inadequate, partial philosophies. (Is the author more sympathetic to half-baked philosophies than to raw theologies?) The method of correlation, of remaining in continuous conversation with the philosophers, is never abandoned.

Every reader will have his own questions to direct to the author, not for the sake of finding fault but for the sake of inviting his further illumination of points that have presented difficulties. The present reviewer is most puzzled by two questions. The first of these relates to the basic structure of being. Professor Tillich affirms (p. 183) that the "ontological question presupposes the subject-object structure of being" and this structure is the basic one. Yet no such use seems to be made of this primary structural characteristic of being in the development of the theology as is made of the less basic structural elements in reality. In so far as the ultimate object of the ultimate subject is defined it is the world. Hence the fundamental overagainstness of self and that which it is up against, not the world but the ground of the world's being—this encounter which presents itself to many of us as *the* religious problem, the problem of ultimate concern, seems not to be clearly set forth here. The "ontological shock" for Tillich is the shock of "non-being", not of the subject's non-being in the presence of the power of being in the object. Has Tillich substituted for the polarity of subject-object, of self-other, the polarity of being-nonbeing? And is this a true polarity? In another form the question is this: The problem of ultimate concern to many men does not seem statable simply in terms of being but only of being and value; they know of the ground of being, but what they do not know is the goodness of that ground. The revelation with which they there-

fore begin is not the revelation of God as infinite being in the finite, but of his goodness in evil.

The other question concerns the historical character of revelation and salvation. While there are many references to history as well as a section on the history of revelation the problem arises whether reason itself is not conceived in non-historical fashion, whether the writer does not think of history as giving answers to problems which reasoning existence, itself non-social and non-historical, presents. But is not reason itself historical? And would reason raise these questions if it had not been challenged in human history by revelation? Perhaps this line of questioning is irrelevant, since it may rest on the reviewer's desire for another kind of systematic theology than the one Prof. Tillich intended and is now presenting and which, as it stands, is a noble, a profound, closely reasoned, integrated presentation of the greatest theme in life.

Yale Divinity School. H. Richard Niebuhr.

Natural Religion and Christian Theology: Vol. 1—Science and Religion. By C. E. Raven. Cambridge University Press. 21s.

The first volume of Dr Raven's Gifford lectures consists of a well-documented historical survey of the relation between Science and Religion. A second volume is promised which will deal with Experience and Interpretation. There are many instances of interpretation in the course of this historical survey: here we must concentrate on those which do not await a fuller exposition in the second volume.

Dr Raven's main thesis is well known since the publication of his two books *The Gospel and the Church* (1939) and *Science, Religion, and the Future* (1943). It is that the Christian evaluation of nature as God's handiwork requires us to take much more seriously the unity of the whole divine process as we see it in nature and history. The Incarnation itself unites the spheres of nature and grace. In this book the theme is taken up from a more strictly historical angle. The first four chapters deal with the Bible, the early Church, and the middle ages. During this period the original good news about nature was distorted by miracle-mongering, and the experience either of being persecuted or of coming up against a debased sex-morality. Thus nature was "played down" in comparison with super-nature and the life hereafter. The rise of the scientific movement in the sixteenth century was headed by men of piety, and Dr Raven takes us through a succession of Gesner, Cudworth, Ray, Linnaeus, Darwin, Kingsley, Hort, and many others, from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries, all of whom with varying gifts and from different angles sought to bring together the vision of God and the new learning obtained by study of the natural world. This present volume is ample evidence that to this list we may add the name of Dr Raven himself.

These lectures hold out a challenge both to theologians and to scientists. Theologians have all too often neglected the witness of the natural order, and have often been guilty of the disparagement of

science because of ignorance. It should, however, be pointed out that Nature as understood by the scientist is not the same thing as nature as understood by the theologian when he contrasts it with supernature. It is also possible that the lack of sympathy which Dr Raven rightly puts his finger on is due to the fact that theologians, no less than scientists, suffer from the evils of specialism.

Scientists do not escape Dr Raven's strictures. They have neglected organic and holistic categories for mere mechanism. The historians of science are exposed as parties to this outlook, for they have interpreted the history of science in terms of "an apostolic succession stretching from Copernicus, Tycho Brahe, Kepler, and Bruno to Galileo, and from them by way of Descartes and the mathematicians to Isaac Newton". The author's most original contribution is to show that the work of the botanist Gesner of Zurich and many others precedes by at least a generation the scientific developments under the mathematicians and astronomers.

The characteristic crusading spirit of the author is directed towards restoring a balance. This inevitably leads him to give in turn an unbalanced picture. He notices many things in passing which might be given more weight. This is particularly obvious in three respects:

(i) In replacing Galileo and company with the succession of Gesner, Cudworth, Ray, Linnaeus, and Darwin, the author is bound to neglect the importance of mathematics as an instrument in any sort of science.

(ii) Although reference is made to the economic background of science, it cannot be ignored as an influence in shaping what and how we come to think about science. For this reason the approach in these chapters seems a trifle academic. The vast research which has gone, for example, into such a work as *The Chemical Revolution* by A. and N. Clow may tell us more than the science of the naturalists about what is shaping our world, and raise problems as acute for science as for religion.

(iii) It may be true that "it is not fair to assign to Bacon or to the New Philosophy a primarily utilitarian motive or a practical end", but the fact remains that science in the modern world is power. This aspect varies with the different branches of science. On the one hand, those who research into atomic physics are surrounded with security regulations; on the other hand, the field naturalist's activities are not of interest to M.I. 5.

For all this, we are indebted to Dr Raven, as to no one else, for giving us such a broad survey, and we await with relish his second volume. He states his case with a sense of urgency and carries great learning in this field very lightly. It was surprising, therefore, to find in his last chapter no reference to the work and thought of Dr Schweitzer, especially his conception of "Reverence for life". This might have contributed a bright spot in a gloomy picture.

D. R. Vicary.

Rochester.

THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Vol. I. By R. Bultmann. S.C.M. Press. 25s.

The appearance in an English translation of this major work by one of this century's greatest and most controversial New Testament critics and theologians is an event of outstanding importance for students of the New Testament. This is not the New Testament theology which is likely to fill the long-felt want for such a work on a full scale in English—it is too much the work of a brilliantly independent individual for that—but it is a book nobody can ignore, though hardly anyone will approve of it.

The proportions of the book will strike an English reader as strange. Some 30 pages each are devoted to "The Message of Jesus" and "The Kerygma of the Earliest Church", 120 to "The Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church aside from Paul", and the rest of the book to St Paul. The relative neglect of the teaching of Jesus is due to the author's contention that "*The message of Jesus* is a presupposition for the theology of the New Testament rather than a part of that theology itself" (p. 3). This is reasonable enough, but the reader who is unfamiliar with Bultmann's work on the Synoptic tradition will be astonished at his extreme scepticism about the amount we can really know about Jesus. The reader already familiar with his Bultmann will perhaps avoid astonishment, but will hardly be convinced. It must, however, be emphasized that Bultmann's critical work has far more to be said in its favour than can appear within the limits of the present book, and this the reader fresh to Bultmann must not forget.

The long section on St Paul will be the most helpful part of the book to most readers. The author handles his material with the ease and confidence of a master: occasionally he is irritating, more often illuminating, and always brilliant. His careful analyses of the meaning of Pauline terms are particularly good. This part of the book is also, to one reader at least, sound methodologically. The author maintains that "Pauline theology is not a speculative system. It deals with God not as he is in himself but only with God as he is significant for man, for man's responsibility and man's salvation. Correspondingly, it does not deal with the world and man as they are in themselves, but constantly sees the world and man in their relation to God. . . .

"Therefore, Paul's theology can best be treated as his doctrine of man: first, of man prior to the revelation of faith, and second, of man under faith, for in this way the anthropological and soteriological orientation of Paul's theology is brought out" (pp. 190 f.).

The translation is generally adequate, though occasional Americanisms and hyphenated words like "salvation-event" do not make for easy reading. But even so, this is a book which will richly repay the time spent in its study.

J. N. SANDERS.

PETERHOUSE, CAMBRIDGE.

Schism in the Early Church. By S. L. Greenslade. S.C.M. Press. 21s.

This book will deservedly find many kinds of readers, because it combines qualities not usually found in a work dealing with the history and theology of the early Church. The serious patristic student will note in it much useful material, upon the accuracy of which he can rely; the more general reader will discover it to be an attractively written book, happily preserving its original style as lectures (the Edward Cadbury Lectures), and thoughtfully providing a translation, for the weaker brethren, of Latin sentences when they occur; and all will appreciate its bearing upon questions arising in the modern Church out of the ecumenical movement and schemes for reunion.

In the arrangement of his material Dr Greenslade was presented with an awkward alternative, either to take each major schism in the early Church separately, or else to discuss one by one the chief causes of such schisms and group them under headings such as "personal", "rivalry of sees", "questions of discipline", and so forth. He has adopted the latter course, and in spite of inconveniences attending it, he may be said to have justified his choice. No real difficulty in following his argument has resulted; and in order to give further clarity to the subject he has appended to the book a useful synopsis of the schisms he has treated.

For the member of the Christian Church the book has two distinct kinds of interest. On the one hand, it illustrates the unhappy truth that hatred, jealousy, and self-interest have operated in the leaders and the rank and file of the Church even in the early centuries of "undivided" Christendom. Truly the treasures of the Gospel have been committed to earthen vessels. Human passions have been the chief cause of many schisms, although insistence upon high principle has not always been absent. But Dr Greenslade's book also provokes the reader to inquire if other schisms might have occurred had not charity prevailed. We wonder if the history of these latter could also be written. At any rate we should have welcomed a more definite reference to the sweet reasonableness of Dionysius of Alexandria and his letter to Novatian (*ap.* Eus. *H.E.* vi. 45), which is one of the noblest expressions of charity in this connexion that has ever been penned.

The other kind of interest is connected with questions which arise from movements towards reunion in the modern Church. Dr Greenslade has deliberately underlined his intention here. And I suppose his thesis would be that when we seek for clear and consistent guidance in such matters from the early Church, it is lacking. The views, for example, of Cyprian or Augustine, when faced with theological problems arising out of schism, cannot be wholly acceptable, and indeed are not so, to holders of any point of view to-day. This negative conclusion is valuable if it forces us to confess that the lessons of past history in the Church can never provide adequate guidance for the present, else the continued guidance of the Holy Spirit would be superfluous. There is need, therefore, in the present situation, for experiment, courage, and above all charity, for the healing

of schism within the Body. Perhaps the book would have been more useful if the different senses in which the term "apostolic succession" or "successions from the apostles" has been used in the early Church had been examined. We would end, however, on a note of gratitude to the author for a book which is as unusual as it is valuable.

Trinity College, Dublin. J. E. L. Oulton.

William Lloyd, Bishop, Politician, Author, and Prophet, 1627-1717. By A. Tindal Hart. S.P.C.K. for The Church Historical Society. 30s.

Bishop William Lloyd was an astonishing man. Judged simply by the length of his life (for he died in his 91st year in an age when the retirement of bishops was unknown) and by the number and variety of ecclesiastical preferments which he held, he was a remarkable figure. Moreover, he occupied himself much in the bizarre exercise of the interpretation of prophecy; and this, though the ground of much of his reputation in his own day, stamps him as eccentric and over-credulous in our own times. Indeed it has to be remembered that his credulity was almost excessive; for he supplied Bishop Burnet with some of the circumstantial details in support of the warming-pan legend concerning the birth of the Old Pretender! Notwithstanding, Lloyd must be judged by the standards of his own age, not by those of ours; and perhaps he might have replied that he would prefer the credulities of his day to the superstitions which we cherish.

Apart from these considerations, however, he played an important part in the ecclesiastical and political events of a stirring epoch. Perhaps his activities in relation to the Papists during the reign of Charles II and his part as a Court agent in the infamous Popish plot are the least pleasing of his achievements; and unfriendly critics commented on the reward which he received by promotion to the see of St Asaph in 1680. During the reign of James II he became famous as one of the Seven Bishops sent to the Tower; and at the Revolution of 1688 he, together with Trelawny of Bristol, became a Juror, thus parting from many of his former friends and close associates. Indeed he became a warm champion of William III and of his religious policy, and reaped his reward by translation to the see of Lichfield and Coventry, and finally to that of Worcester.

With the accession of Anne, another face of things was seen both in Church and State; and Lloyd incurred the formal censure of the House of Commons and dismissal by her Majesty from the position of Lord Almoner, because of his active part on behalf of the Whigs and against Sir John Packington in the Worcester elections for the county. Behind all his political activity he was a vigorous and energetic administrator of his diocese; he was regular and careful in ordinations, diligent in confirming the laity, severe in punishing moral offences both of clergy and laity, zealous for education, ready to argue with Dissenters, and always eager for the welfare of his clergy. Yet he found time to engage in the study of prophecies, and

like many other votaries of that art, believed himself to be able to predict future events in the history of the world. Lloyd was not indeed a figure of the first rank, either as ecclesiastical statesman, bishop, or divine. But he was high in the second rank, and as such well worthy of a biography.

Dr Tindal Hart has made the very utmost of his subject and his sources. Thanks to his discovery of the private papers of Archbishop John Sharp (which formed the basis of his biography of that prelate) he has been able to draw a copious picture of William Lloyd also. Furthermore, he has ransacked every corner for supporting and illustrative information, both from printed and manuscript sources. The result is a tribute to his careful and accurate attention to detail, and a mine of learned information. Dr Hart is to be congratulated on having written, and the Church Historical Society on having published, this biography of a typical prelate of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

CAMBRIDGE. NORMAN SYKES.

STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY. By R. F. A. Hoernlé. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

GOD AND THE WORLD. By T. M. Forsyth. Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

There is an age-old question, What is God's relation to the world, and what is man's place in the scheme of things? Religion claims to give an answer; and on the completeness and persuasiveness of that answer depends in a measure the power of religion over men. Man is a knower; and we want to know what knowledge is, and whether it is dependable. Here Hoernlé's book is most helpful. He possesses a robust faith in human knowledge which refuses to capitulate to sophisticated arguments, and for which he can give his reasons. In his delineation of the world in relation to man the knower, theologians will discover certain elements of particular interest for them.

The universe is an articulated, intelligible whole, which forms the context of all our life and thought, and is self-revealing and self-evidencing. The parallel is obvious with the Christian doctrine of the Logos giving wholeness, meaning and purpose to the Creation, and the insistence by von Hügel, and others like him, on the importance of "the given".

Those who have tarried long in the realm of puzzled discussion about the relations of reason and revelation will be helped to clarity of thought and sober confidence in man's ability to reach truth by Hoernlé's vigorous pages. This is most valuable in an age when uncertainty and doubt can be paralysing; and a school of thought decries human reason and would lead us back to uncritical acceptance of authoritarian revelation.

Hoernlé's book is composed partly of reprints of essays contributed to philosophic journals, and partly of unpublished notes for lectures. We have tried to indicate something of their general trend. A few other conspicuous elements call for notice. Hoernlé will have nothing

to do with materialism and epiphenomenalism, both of which come in for trenchant criticism: and if he can give no finally satisfying account of the relations of mind and matter, at least he leaves no doubt that they are constituents of one indivisible whole.

In his discussion of universals as norms of judgment he throws light on the relation of our Lord to men as the ideal man, which is all the more significant because he never explicitly mentions that theme.

Lastly he is insistent on the validity of knowledge in the value-judgments which are the basis of morality, and on all that this implies concerning the rationality and perfectibility of the universe.

Forsyth's volume is a survey of the doctrine of the relation of the World to God as found in Plato, Aristotle, Spinoza, and believers in Emergent Evolution, followed by a chapter on "Some Recurrent Problems". It is a masterpiece of compression and clearness, and is more direct than Hoernlé's book in its bearing on theology. Those who know something of these thinkers will be sent back to them again stimulated to search even more vigorously for the truths they contain. Forsyth shows how these great teachers have insisted on the rationality of the world; the governance of God, and not blind necessity; how mind is superior to matter. From it all there emerges an impressive picture of a universe in which man as intelligent can find himself at home, and which he can believe is fundamentally good. It was Plato who showed that it is the "form" of the Good which makes the universe one: Aristotle who pointed out that God moves the world because he is loved. Attraction not coercion is the determinant of change; a message peculiarly appropriate to a generation in peril of succumbing to the practice of power politics and the worship of material force. Spinoza adds to Plato and Aristotle a deepened sense that the world is God-impregnated, that it is he who binds all together, and is at once immanent and transcendent.

Those who hold theories of Emergent Evolution have once more set us to think out the relation of Being to Becoming, and made it harder for us not to take Time seriously as an element in reality. Eternal and temporal are not just contradictories, but complementary constituents in one great whole.

The concluding chapter will help every Christian to a fuller appreciation of his faith as an understanding of the universe in which his life is set here and hereafter.

TORRINGTON. C. J. BARKER.

"INASMUCH AS . . ." The Story of Sister Dora of Walsall. By Millicent Price. S.P.C.K. 5s.

IF THOU CRIEST AFTER KNOWLEDGE. By Sir Alymer Firebrace. Allen and Unwin. 25s.

Townships in the Black Country of the industrial West Midlands are notoriously grim and forbidding to the passing stranger. They have, however, among other admirable characteristics, the loyalty of a village mind for their own time-worn rootedness and not least for

those recent traditions associated with the sordid particularities of the Industrial Revolution.

A good example of the latter is Walsall's "Legend of Sister Dora". In the centre of this Black Country town, clad in nursing sister's gown, stands her statue—"the first public statue", alleged a newspaper of the time, "erected to a woman who did not happen to wear a crown." A plastercast copy of the same statue (unmentioned by the author) is also found in the local modern hospital, first opened "In the name of Sister Dora".

Obviously Sister Dora was something of an "original". Mrs Price, as the late Bishop of Lichfield remarks in a Foreword, has done well to let the facts of her life speak to a wider audience. The daughter of the Rev. Mark Pattison, Rector of Hawkswell (whose eldest son was the better known Mark Pattison, Principal of Lincoln College, Oxford, and who incidentally had not much relish for his sister's temperament!), she came to Walsall in 1864 as a member of the Sisterhood of the Good Samaritans. Unsuited by nature for a rule of such obedience—"I am a woman and not a piece of furniture!"—she left the Order after ten years and settled in Walsall and "developed her ministry to the hospital and to the town, in her own way", till her death in 1878. Before and during all these years Mrs Price gives us the record of a prodigal and Christian self-giving which has hardly been exceeded. There was more than a touch of St Francis, as Mrs Price reminds us, about this formidable daughter of a vicarage who could kiss a man dying of the loathsome but recurrent smallpox and who was among the first to suck the poisonous mucus from the incised throat of a child about to die from diphtheria.

It is all a brave story of a devout churchwoman and simply told. Those who frame the industrial wastes of this Black Country from the window of a passing railway carriage must often have asked themselves, How fared the Church of Christ in those days? This book is part of the answer. For Sister Dora and, indeed, many a humble "Sarah Gamp" still live and move in the hearts of the milling multitudes who have scarcely heard of the more bruited Florence Nightingale or Elizabeth Fry. The conditions under which they worked paralyse the imagination of those who luxuriate in a Welfare State. Mrs Price's unpretentious book should do something to rescue Sister Dora from the oblivion she ever sought.

Why has Christianity not spread throughout the world? asks Sir Alymer Firebrace. "The answer is", he replies, "that orthodox Christianity has swerved sharply from the ideals and teaching of its founder, Jesus Christ." It soon becomes apparent that here is a manifesto of what Sir Alymer Firebrace speaks of as "spiritual Science". He writes of "the Scientific System of Metaphysics as found in the Bible", and gives his own interpretation of "The Words and Works of Christ Jesus" and "Man and the Universe". And, as we immediately begin to anticipate, there comes the tribute to Mary Baker Eddy. "The author gratefully acknowledges that his study of her writings has provided him with the metaphysical background and basis without which this book could not have been written."

One is tempted to ask what would Sister Dora have had to say to Mary Baker Eddy! At any rate readers of THEOLOGY will know what to expect from this volume. We fear that, with great respect for Sir Alymer Firebrace's good intentions and his career in the Royal Navy, the London Fire Brigade, and as Home Office Chief of Fire Staff, few of them will be persuaded to join his exegetical assault party upon the Holy Scriptures. Still less can one imagine many of them tripping it with him in the dance of the very bloodless categories of "spiritual Science". It is only fair to the author to say, *he* would be surprised if they did!

WEDNESBURY. A. B. LAVELLE.

SHORTER NOTICES

MARXISM: AN INTERPRETATION. By Alasdair C. MacIntyre. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

COMMUNISM AND MAN. By F. J. Sheed. Sheed and Ward. 3s. 6d.

Mr F. J. Sheed's book is a cheap edition of one first published in 1938 and now in its thirtieth thousand. It presents a Roman Catholic interpretation and criticism of Communism which would have been of greater interest to Protestant readers if it had been brought up to date in the light of recent events in Eastern Europe.

Mr Alasdair MacIntyre has added one more volume to the ever-growing literature about Marx. Yet his contribution is not entirely superfluous. He draws attention to the fact that Marxism shares with the Christian Gospel an emphasis upon redemption and renewal, although how far, as he claims, Marx "inherited" the notion from Christianity is less certain. The fact remains that institutionalized Christianity has more often than not identified itself with the social, economic, and political *status-quo* and tolerated the evils to which Marx so forcibly drew attention. As the author puts it, "It must be granted at once that the Marxist critique is true of a great deal of religion, and in particular of a great deal of nineteenth-century religion."

Probably the author's most valuable point concerns the status of Marxism. Is it religion, philosophy, or science? Marxists claim for their theories the standing of scientific propositions. But, as Mr MacIntyre rightly points out, the essence of science is its readiness to revise and reject old theories in the light of new evidence. This Marxists are not prepared to do. Furthermore, they are concerned not only with what is, with establishing laws of social change, but with advocating what they consider ought to be. In this sense therefore Marxism is a moral or social philosophy. But it is not merely philosophy, because it actively seeks to promote a certain way of life, and in this process has developed an orthodoxy as rigid as any theological system. "The tragedy of Marxism is that it wishes to combine the scope of metaphysics with the certainty of natural sciences." One might add, "and the power of the Medieval Church".

It is doubtful if the world to-day has much more to learn from philosophical analyses of the writings of Marx. We should learn a lot more from a thorough sociological analysis of the working of the Communist Party in particular areas and the factors which have led to the gradual disappearance of the prophetic inspiration and ideals of Marx in the face of man's lust for power. The biggest mistake of Marx was his failure to recognize that there are other forms of exploitation as well as the economic. There is an exploitation of the mind and the spirit which can be just as vicious.

Mr MacIntyre is Assistant Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion at the University of Manchester and this is his first important excursion into print. The reviewer looks forward to seeing his obvious powers of analysis and exposition applied to other important and less hackneyed subjects.

University of Edinburgh. Anthony H. Richmond.

God's World. By G. D. Yarnold. Religious Education Press. 3s.

This lucid little book has as sub-title "The Christian view of the findings of Modern Science", and is designed to be put into the hands of children in the upper classes of Secondary Modern Schools, and the middle classes of Grammar Schools. There are not many books on this subject which can be read both intelligently and usefully by children of these ages, but this book certainly satisfies both conditions. Dr Yarnold reproduces some of his "Christianity and Physical Science" in simple form, but also covers a wider field here. Though the book will need supplementing for older grammar school children, it will not need correcting, and it deserves to be widely used.

Tottenham. J. H. Churchill.

Uncommon Prayers for Younger People. By Cecil Hunt. Hodder and Stoughton. 6s.

The title of this anthology will be rather misleading to young people. All those with whom I am able to discuss these things tell me that they cannot pray in rhyme, and most of this collection is poetry or rhyme. Some of the writings are not prayers at all, and none of the three graces could be offered to God before meals. As introducing young people to some of the world's great prayers, this book has value. They will find the common prayers more useful than the uncommon ones.

Hilda Bennett.

Religion in an African City. By Geoffrey Parrinder. O.U.P. 15s.

Ibadan, the biggest city in tropical Africa, is in the heart of the country of the great Yoruba people of south-western Nigeria. The

Christian Gospel was first preached there just over a hundred years ago, while Islam had entered Yoruba land from the Muslim north a little earlier. In the face of this double challenge, the ancient indigenous religion of the Yorubas is slowly dying, though there are still at least fifty pagan shrines in the town. Islam is on the increase, while the Christian Church seems to have lost a good deal of its earlier missionary zeal. Nearly half the inhabitants of Ibadan may perhaps be counted as at least occasional participants in Muslim festivities, though not as regular worshippers in the mosques; the Christian Church, now represented by more than sixty places of worship—if the many "Separatist" bodies are included—perhaps accounts for some 20 per cent. of the total population. The only answer to this challenge is a revitalized Christianity, deeply rooted in the life of the people, and respecting their desire for spiritual independence, while keeping firm its links with the Church in other lands.

This is only one of many searching questions raised for the Christian conscience by Dr E. G. Parrinder's study, *Religion in an African City*. To survey all the different types of religious life in the town, their beliefs and practices, their places of worship and their organization, their influence on the community generally and on morality in particular, is a vast undertaking; yet the author has compressed the results of his long and patient research into a fascinating story. His own photographs illustrate many of the interesting facts recorded about Ibadan's pagan religions and "Separatist" Churches.

All who have the well-being of Nigeria at heart will be grateful for this valuable study in religious culture-contact, and it may be confidently expected that, whatever their own religion, they will find Dr Parrinder's book of really absorbing interest; but for the Christian reader its challenge is inescapable.

Ibadan. W. D. Gooderson.

One in All. Compiled by E. B. Schnapper. John Murray ("Wisdom of the East" Series). 7s.

One in All is an addition to the well-known "Wisdom of the East" series, and is "an anthology of religion from the sacred scriptures of the living faiths". The selections are arranged under three main headings: the Preparation, the Path, the Goal. The passages dealt with first illustrate the search for knowledge and the necessity for purification and non-attachment to material things. Next come passages showing that the way to the alleged goal of all religions is that of love, humility, devotion, renunciation, and surrender. The goal itself is enlightenment and a realization of oneness with the All. Necessarily such an anthology consists of passages chosen to suit the compiler's monistic religio-philosophy; and in one hundred and forty small pages such passages are bound to be very brief. One cannot regard this volume as a particularly valuable addition to the series.

University College of North Wales, Bangor. D. W. Gundry.

RELIGIOUS FAITH AND WORLD CULTURE. Edited by A. William Loos. Prentice-Hall, New York. $5.00.

This is a collective work of a score of writers. Readers of English theology will probably agree that the best collective book which has been produced here is the famous *Lux Mundi*. It is still possible to read this latter book and hardly to be aware of the changing authorship of the various chapters. The secret, revealed in the biographies of certain of the authors, was the amount of time they spent together and the fact that they shared a common approach and indeed a common mind to the then contemporary theological situation. A glance at the contents of *Religious Faith and World Culture* shows that the editor had planned well to cover many aspects of the contemporary situation. When, however, the essays are collected together in one volume the result is somewhat confusing. For whom are the essays written? Many of them require only the kind of mind which is formed and informed by good leading newspaper articles and wireless talks. But then one is violently shaken by an essay which requires for its appreciation and indeed understanding some acquaintance with the peculiar modern "jargon" of its subject, or the peculiarities of the author, known no doubt to a circle of admiring disciples. There is much overlapping, repetition, and in consequence there is no easeful sense of a progressive understanding of the problems with which the writers deal. It is like perpetually starting a railway journey accompanied by shunting operations: one peeps out of the window to find it is still Platform Three.

The theme of Democracy and Communism is recurrent and there are some admirable expositions of the contemporary political situation. As to the content of World Culture, readers will be left in grave doubt concerning its character. Religious faith, however, we are repeatedly told is necessary to keep it alive. What is this faith? A sort of purged residuum of the great historic religions. Every religion mentioned is in grave need of such a purification, and the resultant amalgam together with education is proclaimed as the necessary basis of world culture. The "global" (a favourite word in the book) character of this work almost makes one long to be an isolationist. Life is becoming too huge and complex; what a relief it is to work in one's own back garden, but how long shall we be allowed to do so?

WANTAGE. C. J. GARDNER.

Note.—The English publishers of *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*, by E. R. Thiele, reviewed here in April (p. 147), are the Cambridge University Press and the price is 45s.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: W. Montgomery Watt, *The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazáli* (9s. 6d.).

BLACKWELL: C. S. C. Williams (Ed.), *The Confessions of St Augustine, Book VIII* [Text with introduction, translation and notes] (10s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: H. G. Wood, *T. R. Glover—A Biography* (21s.); T. W. Manson, *The Servant Messiah* (10s. 6d.); *The Order of the Coronation Service* (8s. 6d.).

CHRIST CHURCH PUBLICATIONS (ST LEONARDS-ON-SEA): Percy Maryon-Wilson, *Plain Talks on the Religion of the Church* (2s.).

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY (U.S.A.): Walter Herbert Stowe, *The Episcopal Church* (25 cents).

COLLINS: Adrienne von Speyr, *The Word* (10s. 6d.).

DACRE PRESS: G. L. Phillips, *Seeing and Believing* (6s.).

EAST AND WEST LIBRARY: Z. H. Chajes, *The Student's Guide through the Talmud* (30s.).

EDITIONS DU SEUIL (PARIS): Jean Daniélou, *Essai sur le Mystère de l'Histoire* (n.p.).

EPWORTH PRESS: C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Sin* (20s.).

FABER AND FABER: F. C. Happold, *Everyone's Book about the English Church* (12s. 6d.).

GENERAL BOARD OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN CANADA: E. R. Fairweather and R. F. Hettlinger, *Episcopacy and Reunion* (n.p.).

HEFFER AND SONS: F. Brittain, *Tales of South Mymms and Elsewhere* (4s.).

HERDER BOOK CO.: James F. Anderson, *The Cause of Being* (25s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: C. M. Blagden, *Well Remembered* (15s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: A. Norman Rowland, *The Fibres of Faith* (10s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: Constance Padwick, *Henry Martyn . . . Confessor of the Faith* [New edition] (7s. 6d., cloth; 4s. 6d., paper covers).

KAVYALAYA PUBLISHERS (MYSORE): M. Hiriyanna, *Popular Essays in Indian Philosophy* (7s. 6d.); M. Hiriyanna, *The Quest after Perfection* (7s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Lucy Menzies (Trans.), *The Revelations of Mechthild of Magdeburg* (18s.); Kenneth Ingram, *Easter Journey* (6s. 6d.); E. C. Rich, *Spiritual Authority in the Church of England* (21s.); William P. Le Saint, S.J. (Trans.), *Tertullian, Treatises on Marriage and Remarriage: To His Wife, an Exhortation to Chastity, Monogamy* (25s.); P. De Letter, S.J. (Trans.), *St Prosper of Aquitaine, the Call of All Nations* (25s.); Thomas Comerford Lawler (Trans.), *St Augustine, Sermons for Christmas and Epiphany* (25s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: E. C. Rust, *Nature and Man in Biblical Thought* (31s. 6d.).

DAVID MCKAY COMPANY, INC.: Dietrich Von Hildebrand, *Christian Ethics* ($6.00).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: *The Coronation, its History and Meaning* (9d.).

OLIVER AND BOYD: G. A. F. Knight, *A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity* (6s.).

ROUTLEDGE AND KEGAN PAUL: C. D. Broad, *Religion, Philosophy and Psychical Research* (25s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Gerhard von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy* (7s.); Nicolas Zernov, *The Reintegration of the Church* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Dwight M. Donaldson, *Studies in Muslim Ethics* (27s. 6d.); Anders Nygren, *Agape and Eros* (35s.).

S.P.C.K. and C.U.P.: E. C. Ratcliff, *The Coronation Service of Queen Elizabeth II* (8s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. and O.U.P.: Maurice Frost, *English and Scottish Psalm and Hymn Tunes c. 1543–1677* (£5 5s.).

S.P.C.K. (for THE RELIGIOUS DRAMA SOCIETY): B. M. Clegg, Daphne Rands and Bess McArthur, *Past and Present* (Three Short Plays) (3s. 9d.).

VERLAGSHANDLUNG DER ANSTALT (BETHEL): Johannes Fichtner (Ed.), *Wort und Dienst* (DM. 7.75); *Bultmanns Entmythologisierung* (DM. 0.80).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher